

**Economic and Social Council**

Distr.: Limited
25 June 2013
English
Original: French

Committee for Programme and Coordination**Fifty-third session**

3-28 June 2013

Agenda item 7

Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-third session**Draft report***Rapporteur:* Ms. Hélène Petit (France)**Addendum****Programme questions: evaluation***(Item 3 (b))***Evaluation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
(E/AC.51/2013/4)**

1. At its 7th meeting, on 6 June 2013, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the evaluation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) (E/AC.51/2013/4).
2. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and responded to questions raised during the Committee's consideration of the report.

Discussion

3. Delegations expressed appreciation for the relevance of the report and stated that the results would be useful in learning about the important work being done by UNODC in helping countries respond to drug- and crime-related threats. In particular, they underscored the importance of the Office's technical assistance work in strengthening the capacity of Member States to set norms and adopt policies.
4. Some delegations expressed satisfaction with the Office's research and analysis work, in particular its annual *World Drug Report* and its surveys on illicit crop cultivation, as important sources to inform their decision-making processes. Others remarked that UNODC could improve the dissemination of its work and consider having a coherent communications strategy to enhance the effectiveness of its research and analysis work.



5. Concerns were expressed about the ability of UNODC to monitor results in the field, and to establish a fully operational integrated programming approach that responds to national priorities. Questions were also raised regarding the role that OIOS played in assisting UNODC to strengthen its evaluation capacity.
6. Delegations also expressed concern about the level of regular budget resources assigned to UNODC. In this regard, they recalled General Assembly resolution 67/193, in which the Assembly expressed its concern regarding the overall financial situation of UNODC, emphasized the need to improve the cost-effective utilization of resources by the Office and requested the Secretary-General to submit proposals in his proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 to ensure that the Office has sufficient resources to carry out its mandates.
7. The same delegations stressed the need for the Secretary-General to strictly implement the above-mentioned resolution while presenting his budgetary submission for the biennium 2014-2015.
8. Other delegations remarked that budget matters were not within the purview of the Committee.
9. Some delegations asked questions about the continued challenge facing the Office in meeting the needs and priorities of the beneficiary countries within the framework of increased earmarking of extrabudgetary contributions. One delegation expressed the view that UNODC could not be expected to deliver results given the high level of strict earmarking.
10. Concern was also expressed over the high level of earmarked contributions provided to the Office, and its negative impact on the implementation of its programme.
11. Concern was raised by several delegations regarding the OIOS recommendation on fundraising and earmarking (recommendation 4). Several delegations strongly supported the recommendation on setting a goal to reduce the earmarking of extrabudgetary contributions so as to enable UNODC to respond more effectively to the needs and priorities of Member States. Other delegations were equally strongly against the recommendation noting that it would not increase the availability of extrabudgetary resources.
12. A number of delegations expressed concern over the growing number of mandates given to UNODC and about the Office's arrangements for collaboration with other entities in order to respond to those mandates in a more effective manner.
13. Questions were raised by delegations on the regional approach to UNODC operations and the use of the logframe approach for the evaluation exercise, and they expressed their support for an integrated programme approach to UNODC operations.
14. Several delegations expressed full support for the results and conclusions of the report and to the recommendations contained therein.

Conclusions and recommendations

15. **The Committee noted the global nature of challenges confronting UNODC and recognized the effectiveness and the impact of the activities of the Office in the field, while acknowledging the specificities of its current structure.**

16. The Committee emphasized, in particular, the value of the Office's provision of technical expertise in supporting the efforts of Member States, upon their request, in ratifying international instruments, as well as its role in mobilizing financial and technical assistance to meet the needs of Member States in their fight against drugs and crime.
17. The Committee further noted the value of UNODC research and analysis, and its publications, and considered that the findings of the evaluation report underlined the important contribution of the Office to capacity-building at both the regional and national levels.
18. The Committee also noted the need for a wider operational knowledge management strategy that could further leverage the Office's research and analysis work for potential impact.
19. The Committee appreciated the report of OIOS and took note of the recommendations contained therein.
20. Upon enquiry, the Committee was informed that the reference to counterfeiting in table 2 referred to the illicit trafficking of property.
21. The Committee stressed the need for UNODC to improve synergies with other United Nations entities, with the aim of increasing efficiency in programme delivery while avoiding duplication and overlapping.
22. While noting the information provided in the programme impact pathway for UNODC, the Committee emphasized that expected accomplishments and, where possible, indicators of achievement were included to measure achievements in the implementation of United Nations programmes by the Secretariat and not those of individual Member States.